

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-19 are pending in the present application. New claims 18 and 19 have been added.

Amendment to the Specification

A substitute specification was submitted on December 11, 2006. In paragraph [0067] of the substitute specification, "In step S14, in Fig. 4, the CPU 10 scales up/down the image Ty/Iy-fold, where Ty is a height of the text while Iy is a *height* of the image" was amended to --In step S14, in Fig. 4, the CPU 10 scales up/down the image Ty/Iy-fold, where Ty is a height of the text while Iy is a *width* of the image--. (*emphasis added*).

After a further review of the specification, Applicants realized that the foregoing amendment was inadvertently made and that the word "height" should be maintained as in the original specification. In view of this, the foregoing amendment has been made to the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1 and 3-19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hyon (U.S. 2002/0077135) in view of Baker (USP 6,546,417), and further in view of Ostermann et al. (USP 6,990,452). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In the Reply, claim 1 has been amended to claim:

said image transforming means that scales up/down said registered image to adjust a height of said registered image to a height of said text, serving as a reference, in accordance with said size attribute data, so that the height of said registered image matches the height of said text sandwiching said registered image when displaying a horizontal writing, and to adjust a width of said registered image to a width of said text,

serving as a reference, in accordance with said size attribute data, so that the width of said registered image matches the width of said text sandwiching said registered image when displaying a vertical writing.

This feature is disclosed in paragraph [0068] of the substitute specification submitted on December 11, 2006.

In the Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges that Hyon fails to disclose:

- H) said image transforming means that scales up/down said registered image to adjust a width of said registered image to a width of said text, serving as a reference in accordance with said attribute data; and
- I) so that a size of said registered image matches said character size of said text sandwiching said image.

Therefore, the Examiner relies on the Baker reference and alleges that it discloses these features by referring to the statements in col. 8, lines 26-40 of Baker.

As the Examiner states in the Office Action, Baker states, in col. 8, lines 26-40:

In order to accommodate the use of different size fonts in the mailbox display, means for scaling the size of the icon graphics are also provided . . . at least one image for each icon is stored, the icon most closely matching the point size of the font is chosen and then scaled as needed to better match the font point size. (*emphasis added*)

Therefore, in Baker, the size of the icon graphics is scaled by (i) selecting an icon most closely matching the point size of the font; and (ii) further scaling the selected icon as needed to better match the font point size. Further, as shown in the figures, Baker only takes horizontal writing into account.

In contrast, the claimed invention of the present application has "image transforming means that scales up/down said registered image to adjust a height of said registered image to a

height of said text, serving as a reference, in accordance with said size attribute data, so that the height of said registered image matches the height of said text sandwiching said registered image when displaying a horizontal writing, and to adjust a width of said registered image to a width of said text, serving as a reference, in accordance with said size attribute data, so that the width of said registered image matches the width of said text sandwiching said registered image when displaying a vertical writing,” as recited in claim 1. In other words, the “image transforming means” of the present invention takes a different approach (i.e., height matching v. width matching) based on whether a horizontal writing or a vertical writing is displayed.

Such a feature is neither disclosed nor suggested by Baker.

Therefore, even assuming that Hyon, Baker and Ostermann can be combined, which Applicants do not admit, Hyon, Baker, and Ostermann, taken singly or in combination fail to disclose or suggest the “image transforming means,” as recited in claim 1.

Claims 3-5 and 9-14, variously dependent on claim 1, are allowable at least for their dependency on claim 1.

Independent claims 6, 7, 8, 18, and 19 are allowable at least for the similar reasons as stated in the foregoing with regard to claim 1.

Claim 15, dependent on claim 6, is allowable at least for its dependency on claim 6.

Claim 16, dependent on claim 7, is allowable at least for its dependency on claim 7.

Claim 17, dependent on claim 8, is allowable at least for its dependency on claim 8.

In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Conclusion

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of the pending claims in the present application are respectfully requested.


The Examiner is respectfully requested to enter this Amendment After Final in that it raises no new issues. Alternatively, the Examiner is respectfully requested to enter this Amendment After Final in that it places the application in better form for Appeal.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Maki Hatsumi Reg. No. 40,417 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: March 5, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

for By  (Reg. # 40,417)
Michael R. Cammarata
Registration No.: 39,491
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant